THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, OCTOBER, 1910

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Oregon, South Dakota, Washington, and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

Thirty-nine Branch Committees; 15,317 members in 299 cities, towns, and villages.*

MISS MARY S. AMES, President.

MRS. J. RANDOLPH COOLIDGE,
MISS ANNA L. DAWES,
MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD,
MRS. CHARLES D. HOMANS,
MISS AGNES IRWIN,
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY,
Vice-Presidents.

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer, Walnut Street, Brookline.
MISS ELIZABETH JOHNSON, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y.
Room 615 Kensington Building, Boston.

** Net present membership of women over 21 years of age: eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations and removals from the state.*

THE OKLAHOMA AMENDMENT.

THE exact title of the proposed woman suffrage amendment to the constitution of Oklahoma, which is to be submitted at the general election next month, is as follows:

"The purpose of this amendment is to authorize women to vote under the same circumstances and conditions as men may now do so under the laws of this state, and this purpose is effected by striking out the word 'male' wherever it exists as a limitation in section 1 or article 3 of the constitution of the state."

The constitution of Oklahoma makes provision for the initiative and referendum. Amendments may be brought before the voters either through the initiative or through the action of the legislature; but with this difference, that amendments submitted by the legislature require for ratification only a majority of the votes cast upon the question, while amendments presented through the initiative must receive a majority of all the votes cast at the election. It is left to the option of the Governor to determine whether the vote upon an amendment shall be taken at the primary election in August, or at a special election or at the general election in November. The Governor assigned the woman suffrage amendment to the date of the general election.

CONFUSION IN OREGON.

AN extraordinary situation has arisen in Oregon. The form of the amendment decided on in that state by the suffragists was one which, if adopted, would give the ballot to taxpaying women only. The title of the amendment, which was filed with the secretary of state July 5th, was "Women Citizens' Taxpaying Suffrage Amendment," and it read as follows: "It is hereby provided that no citizen who is a taxpayer shall be denied the right to vote on account of sex." The accompanying argument, presented for publication in the pamphlet which is sent out to the voters by the secretary of state, declared: "Oregon has now the opportunity to put herself on record as the first state to lead the van in a safe, sane and conservative extension of the elective franchise to every woman who pays a tax to support the government."

There was no ambiguity about this. The policy of asking for the ballot for tax-paying women only was deliberately adopted by the Oregon suffragists two years ago. It was described by its originators as the "one-step-at-a-time policy." It was for this restricted suffrage that signatures were obtained and filed with the secretary of state. So late as August 6th, The Woman's Journal printed a letter from Mrs. Duniway, President of the Oregon State Equal Suffrage Association, furnishing the text of this proposed amendment and the argument filed in support of it.

It now appears that, by an extraordinary bit of legerdemain this amendment for restricted suffrage has been transformed into an amendment granting suffrage to all women. This is not the amendment which was petitioned for; it is not the amendment which was filed with the secretary of state July 5th; it is a form which was agreed upon at a private conference between Mrs. Duniway and the assistant secretary of state. Moreover, this conference was held and the sweeping change in the proposal was made exactly eighteen days before The Woman's Journal printed Mrs. Duniway's presentation of it as a taxpaying amendment. This appears from the following extract from a letter written by Mrs. Duniway from Salem, Oregon, July 19th and published in the Portland Telegram of July 27th:

Recently, the title chosen for the ballot by Attorney-General Crawford was called to our attention, and not being satisfactory to our state executive committee, as it did not, in our opinion make the meaning of our petition clear, I came to Salem at the General's kindly suggestion and have this morning held a conference with him and the equally obliging Assistant Secretary of State, who having discovered that the words

"white male" had been omitted from our pending amendment, kindly eliminated the word all from the ballot title; and, upon showing clearly that the omission of the words "white male" from the constitution will not only allow all women to vote, if our amendment is adopted, but will enable men to eliminate the words "white male" from the state constitution, and thus place it in harmony with the Constitution of the United States, we gladly accepted the omission as providential.

The Woman's Journal of August 20th, in an editorial article entitled "A Surprise in Oregon" says:

Now it appears that, by some singular mistake — whether committed in the office of the Secretary of State or of the Oregon E. S. A., nobody is able to say — the amendment has been so worded that it will give full suffrage to all women, whether taxpayers or not. It is most remarkable that this should not have been found out until so short a time before the election, but such is the fact. . . .

The president of the Oregon E. S. A., while surprised at the changes that have crept into the amendment, says that the omission of the tax qualification will allay the hostility that was developing on the part of the labor unions, and will win the support at the polls of many who objected to the more limited measure.

Mrs. Duniway's own letter, already quoted, indicates just how the changes "crept into" the amendment, and seems to make her surprise superfluous. But what the voters of Oregon will think of this juggling with the amendment, which makes it an entirely different thing from that which was petitioned for, and whether the supreme court of the state, if sometime called upon to decide upon the validity of the amendment in its revised form, will coincide with Mrs. Duniway in regarding the changes made as "providential" remains to be seen.

THE ENGLISH SUFFRAGE BILL.

THE so-called "Conciliation" suffrage bill, which came to a vote in the House of Commons last July, was entitled "A Bill to Extend the Parliamentary Franchise to Women Occupiers." It provided that every woman possessed of a household qualification, or of a £10 occupation should be entitled to be registered as a voter, and when registered to vote for the county or borough in which the qualifying premises were situated. The practical effect of the bill, if it had been enacted, would have been to enfranchise about a million women, most of them unmarried and most of them propertied.

As there are at present about seven million male voters in Great Britain, the women voters, under this bill, would have been outnumbered in about the ratio of seven to one. It might be argued, and indeed was argued, that such an addition to the electorate could not result in any great changes in public policy. Even a statesman ordinarily so astute as Mr. Balfour, the Conservative leader, supported this bill, while he declared that he would obstinately resist any further extension of the vote. Mr. Lyttleton expressed himself in similar terms. It is amazing that sane men, capable of party leadership, could have imagined for a moment that the agitation for woman suffrage would stop with the enfranchisement of a comparatively small and select class of women. It is not the habit of revolutions to stop half-way. Short-sighted Conservative leaders like Mr. Balfour and Mr. Lyttleton, who imagined that the bill would result in a tidy addition to the Conservative vote, would have had a painful awakening later on.

Mr. Shackleton, who introduced and pressed the bill, with what was regarded in some quarters as painful candor, made no concealment on this point. He described the bill as "the thin end of the wedge," and urged it frankly as a first step toward full adult suffrage. Obviously, it is as the thin end of the wedge that such partial suffrage measures should be regarded, and no one should support them who is not willing to assist in driving the wedge home to a more complete riving of existing institutions. For example, British public sentiment would not long sustain the principle that marriage should be a bar or disqualification for suffrage, in the case of women. The Shackleton bill involved many gross absurdities. One of them Mr. Churchill pointed out when he said that, under the bill, a woman leading a life of shame could vote; but if she married and became an honest woman she would lose her vote, only to regain it through a divorce. A system working out such results could not long be tolerated.

In another column, a comparison is made between the vote on this bill and that on the bill of 1908, showing that there has been a decline in the suffrage strength instead of a growth, as some American newspapers have rashly assumed. It remains only to show how political parties divided. One hundred and sixty-one Liberals voted in favor of the bill, and 60 against it; 87 Unionists in favor and 113 against; 31 Labor members in favor and 2 against; and 20 Nationalists in favor and 14 against. One hundred and eighty-two members were not recorded either way.

THAT LONDON DEMONSTRATION.

RARELY has there been a more grotesque instance of exaggeration than in connection with the reports of the suffrage demonstration in London on the afternoon of July 23rd. Some romancing reporter wrote that "half a million women" participated; and the Woman's Journal of July 30 described it as "the greatest demonstration of suffragists in the history of the world" and stated that "half a million women marched in a street parade, cheering and waving flags." Any one capable of understanding the difficulty of handling great crowds, or of estimating the number of hours which such a procession would have consumed in passing a given point must have perceived that the report was wildly inaccurate. Just how inaccurate it

was appears in a letter written by Spenser Wilkinson to the Springfield Republican, — a journal strongly committed to the suffrage cause. Mr. Wilkinson, writing the day after regarding the procession, which he had witnessed from his club window in Piccadilly, says: "The procession was, as the numbers show, not representative," and he proceeds:

The idea that these little groups represented the women of their districts or that the whole procession represented the women of England is absurd. These ladies are those who for many years past have been disciples of Mill and of the theorists who have advocated the political equality of the sexes. They were accompanied perhaps by an equal number of young disciples who have grown up in homes where theoretical radicalism prevails. After the procession, in which I think there were at the outside 3500 women, I walked into Hyde park, where a second smaller procession from the west had joined the first, and where in the great open space near the Marble arch 40 platforms had been extemporized. Here for an hour at each platform a group of lady orators took it in turns to address the crowd gathered round that platform. The crowds were for the most part small, 200 or 300 people, a rather larger gathering being collected round the platform from which was to speak Miss Christabel Pankhurst, the leader of the extreme sections of the suffragists.

From this it appears that 'the greatest demonstration of suffragists in the history of the world," — this procession of "half a million women" actually included on a liberal estimate, not more than 6,000 to 7,000 women.

NOTES ON SUFFRAGE AND ANTI-SUFFRAGE.

An attempt was made to commit the Republican state convention in Washington to the support of the pending woman suffrage amendment, but it failed ingloriously. The convention met at Tacoma, August 3rd, and a resolution was offered asking for the incorporation of a woman suffrage plank in the platform. But the resolution was greeted with loud cries of "No, No," from the convention floor, and was promptly voted down. The Tacoma Ledger notes the fact that the women spectators manifested little interest when the subject was presented, and that most of them remained impassive during the feeble hand-clapping which followed the introduction of the resolution.

The motion for a second reading of the woman suffrage bill, in the House of Commons, July 12th, was passed by a vote of 299 to 189. The despatches reporting this vote stated that the majority in favor of the bill was "unexpectedly large." It may be that this phrase misled some of the editors of American newspapers who treated the vote as if it marked a distinct and encouraging gain for the suffrage cause in England. Some papers ordinarily well informed even went so far as to describe this as the first time that a suffrage bill had been given a second reading. The fact is that the vote in the House of Commons last July, so far from marking an advance in the suffrage movement, actually registered a significant decline. On the 28th of February, 1908, the House of Commons ordered a suffrage bill to a second reading by a vote of 271 to 92. In other words, two years ago, of the members who voted upon the question, only 92 voted in the negative; this year, the negative vote was 189, or more than twice as great. Two years ago, the majority in favor of the bill was 179; this year it was only 110. There are 670 members of the House of Commons: of these only 299, or considerably less than one-half, voted for the bill.

The falling-off in suffrage strength is even more apparent when the character of the measures voted upon is taken into account. This year the bill was the so-called "conciliation" bill, embodying what was described as "a practical minimum" and so restricting the proposed grant of the ballot to women that it was hoped that every member who believed in any form of woman suffrage might be persuaded to vote for it. On the other hand, the bill of 1908 was a plain declaration that "in all acts relating to the qualifications and registration of parliamentary voters, words importing the masculine gender should be construed as including women, and that a woman should not be disqualified from voting by reason of marriage." The situation then is simply this: that in 1908 the more radical and comprehensive bill received a majority of 179, while this year the more moderate and strategic bill received a majority of only 110. If the woman suffrage cause continues to "progress" after this fashion in England, it will vanish altogether from view at no very distant day.

It is interesting to notice what became of this majority on the next stage. There were two things which might be done with the bill, after the motion for a second reading prevailed. It might be referred to a Grand Committee, in which case the next thing would be the passage of the bill through the remaining stages within a short time. Or it might be referred to the Committee of the Whole House, which is equivalent to "shelving" it indefinitely. The motion was made that the bill be committed to a Committee of the Whole House, and this motion was promptly carried by 320 votes to 175. As a matter of course, members who had voted against the bill voted in favor of shelving it by reference to the Committee of the whole House; but they were joined by not less than 118 members who had just voted for the bill. These 118 members — of whom 55 were Unionists, 59 Liberals and 4 Labor members — kept their promises to the suffragists by voting for the bill, and then assisted its enemies to lay it upon the shelf.

It has been left to Lady Stout, in a naive letter printed in the London Times, seriously to argue that wo-

man suffrage exercises a beneficial influence upon the birth-rate and upon infant mortality. Woman suffrage was granted in Victoria in 1908; and in 1909 "the birth-rate began to go up for the first time since 1896" and infant mortality "showed a very marked decrease." Lady Stout writes: "As woman suffrage was only gained in 1908 and there has been but a single election since, one is tempted to attribute the increase in marriage and birth-rate, and the decrease in infant mortality to 'votes for women,' though the wisdom of the 'antis' may find another solution to the problem." It is to be hoped that the English "antis" will not be so inconsiderate as to resist such ingenuous logic. American suffragists have not been diffident in their claims as to what may be expected from the grant of the ballot to woman. They have promised a reduction of the tax rate by one-half, the diminution of divorce, the destruction of the Trusts, and the elimination of tuberculosis; but it is not recalled that any of them have predicted that, in the first year after the grant of the ballot to women, the birth-rate will begin to go up and infant mortality to go down.

THE London Saturday Review reports that the idea of a referendum on woman suffrage is gaining ground, but it adds that "somehow the suffragettes and their friends do not seem to welcome it." This is no new phenomenon. When the proposal was made in the Massachusetts legislature in 1895 to submit the question of the expediency of granting municipal suffrage to women to a referendum of men and women, the suffragists opposed the suggestion in the legislature, and after the bill had been passed urged the Governor to veto it. Last year in New York the member who introduced a bill providing for a referendum on the pending suffrage proposal, under which the women of the state would have had a chance to express themselves upon it, was vehemently denounced as an enemy of the suffrage cause, and a member of the Rhode Island legislature who made a similar proposal was similarly treated.

ENGLISH ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS.

A HIGHLY encouraging feature of the English situation is the organization of a National Anti Woman-Suffrage League, upon a broader foundation and with a larger and more representative membership than any previously-existing organization. The Earl of Cromer and Lord Curzon are the leaders in the new movement. The League proposes to raise a fund of £100,000; of which £13,000 was immediately subscribed upon organization.

Among the more than one hundred distinguished men and women interesting themselves in promoting the organization of the League are the Duke of Argyll, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, the Earl of Cawdor, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, the Earl of Cromer, Lord Curzon, the Duke of Devonshire, Lord Goschen, the Earl of Halifax, Mr. Frederic Harrison, Lord Haversham, Canon Henson, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Rudyard Kipling, the Earl of Lansdowne, the Bishop of Manchester, the Duke of Norfolk, Sir Gilbert Parker, Lord Rothschild, the Earl of Shaftesbury, the Dean of Canterbury, Mr. R. C. Lehmann and Mrs. Humphry Ward, Lady Jersey, Violet Markham, Ellen Thorneycroft Felkin, and Maud Beerbohm Tree.

An organization under such leadership, keenly alive to the perils incident to woman suffrage, and with a program adequate to the occasion, cannot fail to accomplish important results. Ordinarily, it is much easier to organize the affirmative than the negative side of a public question. It is highly gratifying that, in England, the anti-suffragists, thanks largely to the energetic and self-sacrificing leadership of Mrs. Humphry-Ward and her associates, were not only able to present more signatures to their petition to Parliament than were gathered by the suffragists, but are now compacting an organization which promises to be more influential than any on the other side, and adequately provided with funds.

WHY WOMEN OPPOSE SUFFRAGE.

THE argument submitted by the Oregon suffragists in support of their proposed amendment contains the following statement:

"No person of safe or sane reasoning power can comprehend the motive that impels a woman who says she does not want to vote to attempt preventing any woman from voting who wants to vote."

The motives of women who oppose woman suffrage and who, in so opposing it, represent the great majority of their sex, are not nearly so occult or so difficult of apprehension by persons of safe and sane reasoning power as the framers of this argument would have the voters of Oregon believe.

Women who oppose woman suffrage do so because they believe that it would be mischievous to society and mischievous to their sex; they believe that women are already bearing their full share of the burdens of life and that it is unfair to load upon them responsibilities for which they have had no training, and for which they have neither strength nor time; they believe that the average man is capable of voting more intelligently and of enforcing the principles for which he votes more effectively than the average woman, and that woman exercises a more beneficent, impartial and helpful influence in social and public questions without the ballot than with it. If the Oregon suffragists are right in their logic, the mere fact that a small minority of women clamor for the ballot ought to silence the large majority who do not want it. It is fortunate for society that the majority of women do not so interpret their duty.